DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 077 030 CS 200 582

AUTHOR Rhome, Frances Dodson
TITLE Manglish: What's It All About?
PUB DATE Oct 72
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Modern Language Assn. (14th, St. Louis, October 26-28, 1972)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Changing Attitudes; Cultural Images; Diachronic Linguistics; *Feminism; *Language Usage; *Sex Discrimination; Social Attitudes; *Stereotypes; Synchronic Linguistics; *Textbook Bias

ABSTRACT

A look at some English and American dictionaries and encyclopedias affirms the charge of "Manglish"--a male orientation of the English language. Sex stereotypes are manifested in occupational titles, certain cultural notions, and societal attitudes which are reflected in our language. School texts and dictionaries perpetuate this sexism and continue to keep women in a passive role against the natural cultural and evolutional process of liberation presently occurring. In order to change attitudes, sexists claim language must also change. Already words such as sexism, chauvinism, chairperson, and Ms. have crept into the language and some now appear in dictionaries and official correspondences. Language is beginning to reflect social change. (HOD)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 077030

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

MANGLISH: WHAT'S IT ALL ABOUT?

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Frances Dodson Rhome
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

FRANCES DODSON RHOME
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH
INDIANA-PURDUE UNIVERSITY
AT INDIANAPOLIS

CS 200 582

Lexicographers now tell us that it is official! The word which for some reason has raised such strong defensive ire from the male stronghold is now not only accepted officially by the United States government but appears also in the dictionary as a recognized title of courtesy. In short, "Ms." appears in a dictionary's definition as an "abbreviation used before a woman's last name or before her given and last names, whether she is married or not." Pronounced "miz," "Ms." does not substitute for the title of "Mrs.," which continues to identify a woman only as her husband's wife. Published in April, 1972 by American Heritage Publishing Company and Houghton-Mifflin Company, The American Heritage School Dictionary is one of the first reference books to acknowledge directly the changing language caused by social and sexist trends, to take steps to adopt accepted common usage into official linguistics, and to initiate conscientious remedies for the presence of sexism.

This particular dictionary, designed specifically for use in secondary schools, follows traditional semantic and etymologic explanations of terms. It was in 1440 in Norfolk, England that Galfridus Grammaticus first began this practice by explaining Latin words and by giving English equivalents; he was followed by many others, such as Nathan Bailey whose Dictionarium Britannicum (1730) interpreted "hard" words from languages. The notion of perfecting language drove lexicographers to entrust Samuel Johnson with publication in 1775 of a "standard" of existing literary usage.

English has gone through a process of constant change since its inception as a "standard" form of communication, just as the Latin of Cicero, the French of Voltaire, or the language of Sanskrit, Indian, Hellenic, Balto-Slavic,

Teutonic, Celtic, Old and Middle English have experienced centuries both of development and of discard. As a flexible, growing thing, our language records day to day life styles, philosophies, social, economic, and technological trends of any nation. Modern scientific philology requires that dictionaries mark this progressive alteration of a language from historical data of time, place, form, and sense of each word, and formulate the arrangement of a definition.

Since English occupies an increasingly prominent place in international communication, it shares with other highly developed languages the ability to express the multiplicity of ideas and refinements of thought in our modern civilization. Its vocabulary is mixed; it possesses inflectional simplicity, and natural, rather than grammatical, gender. Deriving mainly from Indo-European and Germanic language, English claims all nouns as neuter, rather than either masculine or feminine as in the Romance languages. In German the word for sun (Sonne) is feminine, for moon (Mond) masculine; child (Kind), maiden (Madchen), and wife (Weib) are neuter through the vagaries of grammatic gender, for example. But in English, gender is determined by meaning; all nouns naming living creatures are masculine or feminine according to the sex of the individual, and all other nouns are neuter. From the time of one of the oldest Middle English texts, The Peterborough Chronicle (1154), noun endings have tended to be generalized whatever the gender and the type of declensions. And similarly, the word itself ceased to indicate its gender from the moment when people wrote schippes, wordes, or wives for neuter plural nouns; quenes, hondes, soules for feminines as well as for masculines; and a similar ending for consonantal declensions (eyes, eres, fadres, egges, bokes). Attributive gender, as when we speak of a ship as feminine, sun and moon as masculine or feminine, is personification and a matter of rhetoric, not grammar--bearing on the present opposition to arbitrary naming of storms with feminine names and to the immediate problem of the feminists and their concerns with language.

Differing from the customary method of adopting conventional or vulgate words through continued popular usage and normal attrition into standard "acceptable" vocabularies, the women's movement, rather, is forcing changes and is demanding that popular journals and newspapers exclude many terms which feminists claim are chauvinistic and reprehensively discriminatory. New York Congresswoman Bella Abzug introduced a bill which forbids any agency of the federal government to use prefixes that indicate marital status. Journalists, long fertile producers of new words, are responding, illustrated by Benjamin Bradlee's order to Washington Post correspondents in 1970, urging more careful scrutiny of terms of stereotype and condecension. Many college English departments, too, have initiated studies of sexist language. The Indiana College English Association is one instance where, under the guidance of Dr. William A. Sutton of Ball State University, a state commission is charged to find "suggested remedies to 'linguistic ineptitude' found in Manglish" (male orientation of the English language). Computer studies, such as that of Houghton-Mifflin Publishing Company, involve research of heterogeneous materials from novels to science manuals to determine from a five-million word sampling the existence of linguistic sexism in words encountered by the average reader.

This million-dollar study "proved conclusively that there is, indeed, a sexist slant to the materials to which students are exposed in schools," acknowledges Barbara Trombley, Consultant of Houghton-Mifflin, creating a "cultural factor" which dictate male and female roles in society. Words referring to males, she explains, occur with a much higher frequency than those referring to females: boy or boys appearing 4,700 times to 2,200 times for girl or girls, and in any paired male/female relationships of mother/son, father/daughter, uncle/aunt, etc., the male word appears more often. The word he occurs three times more frequently than she.

This computerized study affirms complaints of many feminists, such as Varda One, of sexual bias in school materials. Criticisms are that dictionaries are written by men, that peer male/female terms have not been defined equally in dictionaries; that few words properly show derivation from names of real women while great attention is given words deriving from male names (quisling after Norwegian Vidkin Quisling, boycott from Captain Boycott of Ireland, lynch laws after Captain William Lynch, Macintosh from the name of a Glasgow chemist, bloomers from Amelia Jenks who agitated for women's suffrage in the 19th century): that sex-stereotyped examples are used in illustrative sentences; that the language, like the culture it reflects, is male-oriented; and that a "semantic mechanism" operates to keep women invisible. Casey Miller and Kate Swift, freelance editors and writers currently completing a book about sexism in language and authors of "One Small Step for Genkind" appearing in The New York Times Magazine, April 16, 1972 assert "that English language defines everyone as male by use of the hypothetical person ("the man in the street," "the man on the move," "Land where our fathers died," "our city's fathers") which results in the assumption that, unless otherwise identified, "people in general are men, and that woman is not one with the species of man, but a 'distinct' subspecies." Miller and Swift further contend that contemporary language makes woman a lower caste, a class separate from the rest of man. They charge that men, for the most part, are "defined" as strong, ambitious, virile, leaders, and decision-makers, whereas women are shown to be weak, passive, emotional followers, and domestically, rather than politically, concerned. Central to the charge is the warning that such definitions are a social imposition and male continuance of a 5000-year patriarchial system which denies current behavioral truths.

Certainly a look at some of our English and American dictionaries and encylopedias affirms some of these charges.

One area, the designation of trades and professions to exclusive male and female categories, manifests stereotyped rather than current modes. With the exception of occupations customarily held by females (nurse, secretary, dietician, librarian, teacher, prostitute), most trades generally are accepted as male, unless the word "female" or the ending "--ess" is added. We read farmer, pioneer, electrician, real estate agent, reporter, business executive, for example, but if the individual is a woman we feel obliged to clarify by writing woman farmer, woman pioneer, woman director, or woman president. Social custom views "woman" as a non-professional. In Dictionary of Occupational Titles, a current labor department publication that defines some 22,000 occupations, each occupation is rated on a skill scale from a high of 1 to a low of 887. Listed at the bottom in a ranking far below the 300 level for mammal zoo trainers, hotel clerks, or barbers are homemakers, school teachers, and practical nurses at 878 level.

Yet joint designation of trades for males or females causes linguistic problems. Women claim that distinctions in such cases of authoress, poetess, paintress, patroness, and other areas imply inequality between sexes. An author is an author, that is all that concerns any reader, they say, and it is impertinent curiosity to want to know whether the author is male or female. To some persons the value of the work reduces if it appears with a woman's name, a subject of much anguish to Zelda Fitzgerald when her husband, F. Scott Fitzgerald, felt it necessary to publish some of her stories under his nomer. In Dictionary of Contemporary Usage, Bergan Evans' explanation of terms did not even consider the female sex when he wrote "An author would be thought of as the man who wrote the story....., a writer the man who adapted it for movie or television use." Over twenty years ago H. W. Fowler also wrote a counterstatement regarding use of feminine endings for nouns in A Dictionary of Modern English Usage published by Oxford University Press:

> These ladies neither are nor pretend to be making their objection in the interests of the language or of people in general; they object in their own interests only; this they are entitled to do, but still it is lower ground, and general convenience and the needs of the King's

> English, if they are against them, must be reckoned of more importance than their sectional claims...First, any word that does the work of two or more by packing several notions into one is a gain (the more civilized a language the more such words it possesses), if certain conditions are to be served....
>
> Secondly, with the coming extensions of women's vocations, feminines for vocation-words are a special need of the future; everyone knows the inconvenience of being uncertain whether a doctor is a man or a people regarded as nothing if not practical (p. 176).

Fowler contended that objectors to feminine endings since "their view is that the female author is to raise herself to the level of the male author by asserting her right to his name," were actually misjudging their own interests. But for some reason his word "doctress" has failed to catch on.

The problem, it seems to me, is not so much the comparative efficiencies or "inconveniences" of a male or female doctor, but the fact that persons have always regarded the medical profession to be male-oriented which, in truth it is, as women patients have long been aware. But with changing times, such total domination no longer holds true, and with thousands of young women successfully and efficiently entering all technical, scientific, and industrial professions hitherto practiced by only males, language is forced to reflect this change. Hence, Fowler's original list of trades and professions filled by both sexes must add now the words of "policewomen," "chairwoman," "directress," or "FBI agentress," in spite of many women's preference for generic terms of director, artist, motorist, aviator, and others which describe the profession rather than the sex of the one practicing in it.

In the encyclopedic definition of "man" and "woman," connotations not only respond to societal attitudes but also subtly educate the society to retain certain cultural notions. One learns through the language, and such definitions, say the feminists, keep woman in a less than favorable position. Words denoting man are image-oriented to that of a vigorous person pursuing his fight with the economic dragons while that of woman connotes a more passive, domestic, devoted state. For the female, words applicable to her status apply to home activities;

if at a higher economic level, she is a matron; of at lower levels, she is a housewife. The man is shown also to hold determination in facing trials in a "manly" way, to have a "masculine" mind, a "masculine" love of sports, a "mannish" voice, and to possess a broad range of positive attributes of strength, courage, directness, virility, and independence. Descriptions associated with females give fewer attributes and infer weakness in gentleness, tenderness, feminine "wiles," or "womanish" tears. The current edition of Funk and Wagnalls dictionary describes "housewife" as 'one who does not work for a living." Or, as Fowler put it, "feminine is the epithet for beauty, features, arguments, pursuits, sympathy, weakness, spite, and the like." The Oxford English Dictionary (1961) designates "woman" having "qualities attributed to the female sex, as mutability, capriciousness, prone to tears," and defines the phrase "make a woman of" as meaning to bring into submission.

Social and attitudinal changes fluctuate as our remarkable English language historically demonstrates. We no longer use the term "man-midwife" which was a figurative 17th century term, as in Johnson's The Staple of News (1625). "There are a set of gamesters within, in travail of a thing call'd a play...and they have intreated me to be their man-midwife, the Prologue." Or, the sixteenth and seventeenth century word "agnate," referring to descendants wholly on the male side found in Salic law. Or, the feminine derivative of man "maness" of the Renaissance, used in the Bible (1594), "The man, said, 'This nowe is bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called maness, or mannish, because she was taken out of man." (Our use of "mannish" today implies a different connotation.) Neither is "wapman" in our vocabulary, formerly used from the tenth to the fourteenth century to distinguish the male, derived from a combination of "weapon + man" and alluding to that division to the human race which bears its own weapon or tool.

The first meaning of "wife" was "woman," surviving in such expressions as "fish wife," and "old wife's tale." "Wifman," an early term for womankind, is no longer in our contemporary language. Whereas "womankind," still extant, now refers to women only; the term "mankind" includes all humans.

In addition to the fecundating sex, male and other masculine definitions once had other meanings: (1) an apple, an apple tree, and (2) the human essence, so used in 15th and 16th century phrases. A poem of Lydgate (1430) reads, "The male so wryes, That no kunnying may prevayl....Ayens a wommans wytt." The words "calamite" or "cornuto" describing a male prostitute in Marston's The Malcontent, "Ah you smooth chinn'd calamite" (I,ii,10) are no longer around. Although we retain in popular lingo the term "gentleman" to apply generally to almost any male under most adult circumstances, we now rarely use the term of "gentlewoman," which designated a woman of good birth and breeding of a woman of honorable instincts. It is an old-fashioned, if not archaic,word, and as such tends to be degraded by facetious use. William Cullen Bryant, while editor of New York Evening Post (1829-1837), issued Index Expurgatories claiming that use of "gent" for "gentleman" was "exceedingly" vulgar, and as for the word "gentleman" he makes this comment:

> It is not possible to teach the correct use of this overworked word: one must be bred to it. Everybody knows that it is not synonymous with man, but among the "genteel" and those ambitious to be thought "genteel" it is commonly so used in discourse too formal for the word "gent." To use the word gentleman correctly, be one.

Miller and Swift point out that the word "woman" dropped out of fashion for a time during this century; indeed Fowler also states that "to call a woman a female is exactly as impolite as to call a 'lady' a woman, without any of the sentimental implications that often make 'woman' preferable to lady; it is reasonably resented." And today we no longer see "gents" on doors of those special places. The feminist countermovement, however, supported by the very term of women's liberation, is restoring the term "woman," although that is

not to say that other terms used in subcultures of the English-speaking world are likewise replaced: dolls, dames, chicks, babes, skirts, and broads continue and will be replaced undoubtedly in following generations with others of the same level, just as we have similar, though fewer, terms to be used for men.

To Samuel Johnson belongs the credit of showing how useful quotations may be, when properly chosen, not only in corrorborating the lexicographer's statement but also in revealing special shades of meaning or variations of use which his definitions cannot well express. And to modern dictionary discredit, such illustrations of correct usage tend, unconsciously and subtly, to reflect discriminatory attitudes and historical evidence of chauvinism which most males do not acknowledge. Those who followed Johnson--Dr. Charles Richardson in 1837, New Dictionary of the English Language...Illustrated by Quotations from the Best Authors; Dr. J.A.H. Murray and other editors of Oxford New English Dictionary issued in 1884 and completed in 1928 with selective quotations from all centuries; works in Germany by Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm; in France by E. Littre, and by Pierre Larouse in his Grand Dictionairè in 1904 and 1923; Professor W. D. Whitney's Century Dictionary (1889-1910); Noah Webster's American Dictionary of the English Language; and a host of others--all exemplified usage of words in selective quotations with disparaging results. Features of variations of orthography, full and scientific excellence of etymologies, phonetic precision in pronunciation, and elaborate subdivision of meanings created great dictionaries of comprehensive and academic importance.

But the stick-to-it-iveness of many of those collected quotations of the great 18th and 19th century scholars and lexicographers persists in dictionaries of today and consequently incurs the wrath of feminists who chance to use dictionaries for reference, including that large work force of three million who serve as secretaries throughout our land. Even though the practice of lexicography now extends to hundreds of scholars, specialists, and editorial workers

using advanced computerized and technological techniques in compilation of a dictionary embracing scientific, ethnic, and technological semantic flow, in contrast to Johnson's more singular effort, quotations too often remain static. Note these quotations inserted in leading and current dictionaries, illustrative of definitions of "woman" or "feminine": "A Woman impudent and mannish grown/ Is not more loathed than effeminate man" (Shakespeare); "Woman is fickle"; "It was the immemorial male reply to the restless Woman" (Sinclair Lewis): "An artist of feminine and receptive temperament" (Havelock Ellis); "Frailty, thy name is Woman" (Shakespeare), "Men, some to Bus'ness, some to Pleasure take;/But every Woman is at heart a Rake" (Pope); "I hate a dumpy woman (Lord Byron); "Woman with her tools of magic, the broom and mop" (Nathaniel Hawthorne).

In similar quotations present in all dictionaries published in this century, certain cultural attitudes are both recorded, formulated, and maintained. The sentence "Woman is fickle" appears in dictionaries of the thirties as well as of the seventies, for example, and could be image-forming, should any youth, for some remote reason, feel obliged to look up the term.

Even in the newly-touted American Heritage School Dictionary which was influenced by sexist studies and which advertised efforts to respond to new roles of emancipated women, the balance in support of the cause of human liberation remains tipped. Editors consciously tried to avoid sex-stereotyped examples and cite these sentences as proof":

SHOW: "I'll show them," she muttered. "I'll make a home run."

PRESSURE: She has many pressures on her time.

ACT: Sally acted as chairman.

FORAY: Her opening foray into politics.

INVEST: She invested $18,000 in bonds.

PRESENT: She presented the pennant to the winners.

PRESS: The press of business weight heavily on her time.

TEACHER: He teaches kindergarten.

WAVER: His resolve began to waver.

WELL: Tears welled up in his eyes.

An analysis of theme examples reveal certain cultural attitudes: the female angrily challenged to excel in athletics, "acting" as a "chairman," just entering politics, and giving, not winning, the pennant---this is an individual who is in the process of changing her role, as is the male, shown by these examples in humanitarian terms, one who teaches little children and openly experiences emotion.

But more innocuous and unfortunate from the feminist point of view are other illustrative sentences which occur throughout the text of this new dictionary. Within the first sixty-one pages concerned with words beginning with "a," 193 illustrative sentences deal exclusively with males in contrast to fifty-one with females; pictures of men far outnumber by 70% the few women, and most of those are illustrative of haute couture. Obviously a complete listing of these sentences cannot be repeated, but nevertheless a few selections demonstrate silently and cogently the cultural, educational process and societal value judgment taking place:

FEMALE:	MALE:
I <u>acceded</u> to her request.	He <u>acceded</u> to the presidency.
Don't worry on her <u>account</u>.	The firemen gave a fine <u>account</u> of themselves in action. He was very strong, and was chosen as a guard on that <u>account</u>.
Her ideas were in <u>advance</u> of her time.	He <u>advanced</u> to the rank of captain.
The girl <u>advertised</u> her marital status by wearing a ring. Her parents would never <u>agree</u> to the marriage. He <u>affianced</u> his daughter to a young minister.	He was a bachelor, in itself an <u>anomaly</u> in that part of the county. His <u>apprenticeship</u> prevented him marrying.
She worked for an <u>age</u> on the dress.	He is an extremely <u>able</u> worker. He became of <u>age</u>.

The girls decided to go shopping after all.	He gave all.
She was a nice person, all the same. She all but fainted.	All five boys are good students. All in all, he's a good athlete.
An antique woman hobbled after him.	He was filled with anxiety about his mother's return.
She applied to a college.	He applied for a job. He angled for a promotion.
She acted as if she wanted to leave.	He tried to look brave but he was only acting.
She winked as our eyes met. Her smile is a real asset.	Her feigned sweetness awakened a strong suspicion in his mind.

Here is a woman concerned with health, clothing, sewing, shopping, attractiveness or beauty, the arts, and subject to control of her own marital plans. And here is a man: active, independent, concerned with profession and business, athletic, protective of others, and playing the strong role. Both are living up to a preconceived norm of male/female behavior.

In spite of honest attempts to support the linguistic cause of human liberation, the fact remains that feminists' charges of sexism in school texts and dictionaries is, indeed, shown to be true, undoubtedly because sexism exists in our society. Feminists argue that to continue with female descriptions, apt as they may be for past generations, is to keep women in a passive role against the natural cultural and evolutional process of liberation presently occurring. Such acts go counter to the notion that human rights are indivisible by any category of sex, race, class, caste, nationality, or age, and, in fact, limits human existence by denying human capacities. Sexists' charges bear consideration that traditionally male-dominated editorial staffs may indeed, consciously or unconsciously, be forcing a stereotyped masculine image which natural attrition of the twentieth century no longer supports.

The term "human liberation" is an apt one in this study of language evolution. For as women are liberated to an independency concerning life styles, marriage, and career, so too is the male liberated from traditional patriarchal roles of

the silent, strong man in pursuit of the material to a more humane expression of emotions and less competitive drive.

With all of this social change and reconsideration of roles, language is bound to reflect both liberations. While it may no longer be necessary to retain the feminine equivalent of bachelor as "bachelor girl," linguists may be challenged to replacement of some common generic terms. The term "man" generically includes woman, but feminists claim that the term is too predominantly male-imaged. So, too, is the generic pronoun "he." And that is the problem, also, with terms such as "chairman." In order to change attitudes, sexists claim language must also change. Just as negroes were forced to reintroduce the term "blacks" and to eliminate the term "colored" and as Jews fought against the term "kike," certain stereotyped derogatory connotative connections require, say many women, replacement of generic "man" and "he" in order to raise social consciousness. Members of the National Organization for Women (NOW) have launched a vigorous campaign in this regard and issued specific guidelines for the press. These advocate using language in such a way as to include "women" in referring to homeowners, scientists, and business people, and to reconsider phrases of "men in the office," "the girls in the typing pool" or the (rare) "office boy." Germaine Greer, in The Female Eunuch, discusses such anatomical terms which dehumanize female persons. Jean Faust's "Words that Oppress" and Ms Magazine introduce numerous new terms which may or may not be accepted as corrective measures. The term of "genkind" for mankind, the introduction of "tey" to replace "he," and "gen" for "man," "pn" for person "citizen"---these are but a few suggestions documented in the linguistic battle.

Ridiculous as some of these terms may at first appear, it is to be remembered that "MS" is now, to our amazement, in the dictionary and currently used by numerous large establishments in official correspondence. As new words, such as commuter, interne, tuxedo, enlisted man, bootlegger, pep, telephone, ticker,

probe, socialize, political slate, caucus, dope-fiend, and high-brow have crept into standard writings, so too have sexism, chauvinism, gynecocentric, and androgynous come to full acceptance; so too will the question of "female" vs "woman" as adjectives go through many usages. Strident voices of many liberationists may even reconsider redesignation of weak unaccented syllables of feminine and strong accented syllables of masculine rhymes in poetry! Feminists insist these changes are not intended as degeneration nor vulgarisms of language but instead as a positive regenerative effort to adapt to modern societal evolution.

If language reflects social changes, other related social problems cause replacement of more than mere courtesy titles of address. The woman's loss of her family name through marriage is under scrutiny and is not reflective of any notion to deny her marriage but shows concern instead with the loss of individual identity which the woman experiences in the joint act of marital union, but which the man does not.

In earlier periods of history, the woman left her own tribe when she married and moved permanently to that of her husband, necessitating the adoption of his ways and of his tribal name. Because she no longer lived in the regions of her natal tribe, she dropped her natal name. Today few families remain together in America for long periods of time; not only do the sons, daughters, uncles, aunts, nephews, nieces, grandfathers, and grandmothers move about but they move separately. A major move to a new region is estimated to occur three times in each person's lifetime. Hence, tribal considerations no longer exist, and become exceedingly remote to the woman, who, after dropping her own tribal name upon marriage, now, after divorce or in widowhood, carries a tribal surmane of no direct relationship. The male does not experience this loss of identity; although he may marry several times, he remains John Doe all of his life. Through marriage, the woman, on the other hand, completely obliterates, by

change of name, any connotation which designates her as a specific daughter, a certain professional woman, or any relationship except that of a wife. From being Mary Smith, active on the campus, secretary to a banker, and daughter to the city insurance agent, she is metamorphosed to Mrs. John Doe, and "Mary" disappears from any designation. If she marries more than once, the problem is confounded.

Women's concern, therefore, with the title of "Ms." is not a denial of the natural, healthy, and sacred state of marriage or its nomer. It is to point out that a total change of identity has occurred for the woman which the man has not experienced in any way. He has not had to change his name on his college records, bank statements, life insurance, driver's license. Nor is he ever asked to distinguish his marital position in so many public ways as women: to procur an airline reservation, a magazine subscription, or a library card, or to vote. The woman is asked to designate "Mrs." or "Miss." New York's Jonathan Bingham has introduced a bill before Congress which forbids requiring female voters in any federal election to disclose their marital status unless male voters were so required.

To these problems, therefore, women now direct attention to the language. To use "Ms." in business correspondence is more expedient when addressing a strange person whose marital state is not known. As one male colleague put it, in the vulgate, "It certainly relieves the pressure when addressing an old lady: if she is a widow, "Miss" is an insult, and if she is an old maid, "Mrs." is a reproof!" Fowler's quandary of whether to use punctuational periods after Mr and Mrs, no longer responds to the more basic need for a new term. The prime function of a language, after all, is to interpret the form and pressure of life--the experience, knowledge, thought, emotion, and aspiration of the race which employs it. This being so, the more symbols a language provides for

communication and for a more varied strata of human experience, the more perfect will be its potentialities as a medium of expression. The official adoption of "MS" reflects this response and flexibility!

SELECTED REFERENCES

American Heritage School Dictionary. New York, 1971

Baugh, Albert C. A History of the English Language. Second ed. New York, 1957

Bernstein, Theodore. Miss Thistlebottom's Hobgoblins. New York, 1970

Bierce, Ambrose. Write it Right, "A Little Blacklist of Literary Faults." New York, 1909

Evans, Bergen and Cornelia Evans, A Dictionary of Contemporary American Usage. New York, 1957

Florio, John. A Worlde of Wordes. London, 1598

Follett, Wilson. Modern American Usage, A Guide. New York, 1966

Fowler, H. W. A Dictionary of Modern English Usage. 4th pringing. Oxford, 1950

Mosse, Fernand. A Handbook of Middle English. Baltimore, 1952 and 3rd printing, 1963

The Oxford English Dictionary, London, 1928

Partridge, Eric. A Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English. 5th ed. New York, 1908, 1951

_____. Shakespeare's Bawdy. New York, 1948

Random House. The Random House Dictionary of the English Language, New York, 1966

Roget, Peter Mark. Roget's Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases. Cleveland, 6th printing., 1943

Shipley, Joseph. Dictionary of Early English. Paterson, New Jersey, 1963

Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language. Springfield, Mass., 1961

Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language. New York, 2nd ed., 1970

Wright, Thomas. Dictionary of Obsolete and Provincial English. 2 vols. London, 1869